

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE MIDDLE DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA**

<b>JOHN D. WILSON,</b>	:	<b>CIVIL ACTION NO. 1:07-CV-1301</b>
	:	
<b>Plaintiff</b>	:	<b>(Judge Conner)</b>
	:	
<b>v.</b>	:	
	:	
<b>CATHERINE MCVEY, et al.,</b>	:	
	:	
<b>Defendants</b>	:	

**ORDER**

AND NOW, this 6th day of October, 2008, upon consideration of *pro se* plaintiff's motion for a more definitive statement (Doc. 33), and it appearing that the motion expounds upon the allegations set forth in plaintiff's complaint (Doc. 1, Ex. A) and brief in opposition (Doc. 22) to defendants' motion to dismiss, which the court granted on September 8, 2008, (see Doc. 32), and the court concluding that plaintiffs' motion therefore requests that the court reevaluate its memorandum and order (Doc. 32) granting the motion to dismiss in light of the material contained in the instant motion and brief in support thereof, and the court finding that there are no manifest errors of law or fact in the challenged order, see Harsco Corp. v. Zlotniki, 779 F.2d 906, 909 (3d Cir. 1985) ("The purpose of a motion for reconsideration is to correct manifest errors of law or fact or to present newly discovered evidence."), and that the instant motion sets forth no newly discovered evidence in support of plaintiff's position, see id. ("Where evidence is not newly discovered, a party may not submit that evidence in support of a motion for reconsideration."), it is hereby ORDERED that plaintiff's motion for a more

definitive statement (Doc. 33) is CONSTRUED as a motion for reconsideration of the court's memorandum and order (Doc. 32) dated September 8, 2008 and is DENIED as so construed.

S/ Christopher C. Conner  
CHRISTOPHER C. CONNER  
United States District Judge